

XXXIII. *Extracts from the* MINUTE-BOOK *of the* LINNEAN SOCIETY *of*
LONDON.

1841.

March 16. **READ** a "Letter from Joseph Woods, Esq., F.L.S., to Mr. Richard Kippist, on *Crepis biennis* and *Barkhausia taraxacifolia*."

Mr. Woods is of opinion that the plant described by Sir James Smith in the 'English Flora' and 'English Botany,' by Sir W. J. Hooker in the 'British Flora,' by Mr. Babington in the Society's 'Transactions,' vol. xvii. p. 456, and by Mr. Mackay in his 'Irish Flora,' as *Crepis biennis*, is in reality *Barkhausia taraxacifolia*, distinguished especially by the long beak of its achenia, while those of *Crepis biennis* are, in the words of Gaudin, "neutiquam attenuata." The stem of *Crepis biennis* is also less branched and more leafy than that of *Barkhausia taraxacifolia*, the latter rarely producing a leaf except where there is a branch. Mr. Woods adds, that it is almost certain that we have the two species in England, though the difference has not been noticed. *Crepis biennis* grows in Kent and Surrey.

In a "Note" appended to Mr. Woods's letter, Mr. Kippist states that the authentic Linnean specimens of *Crepis biennis* from Scania, although too young to have ripe seeds, appear to confirm Mr. Woods's idea, the pappus being quite sessile even in those most advanced, and the stem moderately branched in the upper part, and very leafy below. The two specimens in the Smithian herbarium, one from Mr. Crowe's garden and the other from Mr. Rose's herbarium, have the stem much branched, and the pappus apparently sessile, but the achenia are immature.

The only developed specimen in Mr. Winch's herbarium is from Dartford in Kent, and has the pappus very decidedly stalked, the stem much branched in the upper part, and only a few scattered leaves in the lower, a branch being produced from the axilla of each cauline leaf with the exception of one or two of the lowermost. Other

specimens, gathered near Cobham and Ramsgate, in the same county, and near Moulsey in Surrey, agree with Mr. Winch's plant in their stalked-pappus and branched stem, and probably therefore belong to *Barkhausia taraxacifolia*. The only British specimens in the Society's possession that Mr. Kippist believes to be referable with certainty to *Crepis biennis* are two in the Hortus Siccus of Mr. Woodward, with ripe achenia and perfectly sessile pappus; the habitats of the plants are not given, but in all probability they were gathered either in Suffolk or Norfolk.

April 6. Read an Extract of a Letter from J. Burnham, Esq., to Hyde Clarke, Esq., F.L.S., on a supposed new British *Juncus*. Communicated by Mr. Clarke.

Mr. Burnham states this *Juncus*, which he proposes to call *Junc. lucens*, to be not very uncommon about villages and country-towns in Shropshire and Herefordshire, and to be met with also in other places both in England and on the continent, viz. in France and Bavaria. He thinks it may have been confounded, if observed before the flowering season, with *Junc. effusus*, from which however its thick and light-coloured culms at all times distinguish it. The following is Mr. Burnham's description of the plant:

“Planta pedalis et ultrà; radicibus parvis conicis, fibris inconspicuis; culmis plurimis æqualibus, omnibus florentibus, nec unquam sterilibus, subcylindricis (medullâ subtetragonâ albido-viridi, strato exteriore flavescenti annulis concentricis conspicuis), glaberrimis, tegumento unctuofo (huic speciei proprio) indutis, junioribus spathâ communi papyraceâ circumvallatis, adultis spathâ lacerâ effusis subsolitariis; capitulis terminalibus compactis; perianthis oblongo-lanceolatis, flammeis, erectis, evanescentibus; pedicellis nigrescentibus. Cæterùm *Junco effuso* simillima.”

Mr. Burnham suspects that this plant is alluded to in Ray's ‘Synopsis Stirpium Britannicarum,’ and it seems probable that it may be the same with *Juncus effusus*, β . of Smith's ‘English Flora,’ vol. ii. p. 168.

Nov. 16. Read "Descriptions of some Vegetable Monstrosities," by the Rev. William Hincks, F.L.S., F.R.S.E. &c. &c.

In this paper, which is a continuation of one read before the Society towards the close of the year 1839, and of which some account is given at page 691 of the previous volume, Mr. Hincks arranges the monsters described by him under the several heads of adherences, transformations, and increased or diminished developments of particular parts.

The adherences comprise, first, a case of the union of five grapes into one fruit in so complete a manner as to render it probable that the flowers were also united; secondly, an instance of cohesion between four peduncles of *Centaurea moschata*, without fusion of their capitula; and thirdly, the common case of adherence of two flowers of *Fuchsia fulgens*. The latter is introduced for the purpose of remarking how frequently, when the usual number of organs in a circle results from the suppression of certain parts rudimentally present, the same cause which produces adherence with the nearest flower, also develops all the rudiments, and thus increases the number of parts. On the other hand, in cases of union by fusion, that is, where the united flowers form one enlarged flower, Mr. Hincks observes, that one organ at least is generally sacrificed at each point of junction.

Of transformations Mr. Hincks notices two: first, a terminal bud of an *Azalea*, gathered about the period when the plant ceased to produce blossoms, which is partially converted into a flower, the leaves nearest the centre being imperfectly changed into stamina, and surrounded by many of petaloid aspect, while the outer leaves differ from the ordinary appearance only in having a little colour; the organs are not arranged in circles, and one leaf only, and that among the most remote from the centre, assumes the form of a pistillum. The second transformation described occurs in a specimen of *Gentiana campestris*, in which all the parts of the flower are converted into leaves, which are somewhat petaloid and crowded

into a rose-like tuft; this kind of transformation is similar to that described and figured by DeCandolle in *Trifolium repens*.

The first case of increased or diminished development noticed by Mr. Hincks affects a specimen of *Anagallis arvensis*, resembling one described by M. Moquin-Tandon as found by M. Gay, in which an increased development of the exterior circle is accompanied by diminution in the interior ones: the effect produced is stated to be very unequal in different flowers, but the more the calyx is enlarged, the more the interior circles are contracted. The second case is the well-known wheat-ear carnation, *Dianthus Caryophyllus imbricatus*, L., which is noticed as probably affording the best example of the monstrous multiplication of a particular circle. A third case occurs in a capitulum of *Matricaria*, in which the bracteæ, consisting under ordinary circumstances of paleaceous scales, are enlarged into full-sized leaves, completely deforming the flower: the rose-ribwort is noticed as a phænomenon of the same kind. Fourthly, Mr. Hincks mentions a monstrous variety or highly developed form of *Convallaria multiflora*, cultivated at Kew, which he presumes to be the *var. bracteata* of De Candolle and Duby: in it the number of flowers usually reaches five or six, and each of them proceeds from the axilla of a small leaf on the pedicel. And lastly, the author notices under this head a case of abortion or atrophy affecting the leaf of a fern cultivated by Messrs. Rolleston, by which in one instance the whole side of a frond, and in another the secondary veins with the parenchyma at both sides are entirely suppressed; a phænomenon which he has also observed in *Scolopendrium officinale*.

Dec. 21. The Secretary announced to the Society, that, since its last Meeting, it had sustained a severe loss by the Death of its Librarian, Professor Don, which took place at the Society's House on the 8th instant.

1842.

Feb. 15. An Election took place to supply the Vacancy caused by the Death

of Professor Don, when Mr. Richard Kippist was chosen in his place.

March 1. The Secretary reported that since the last Meeting the Society had received from Mr. Borrer the present of a valuable Herbarium of Foreign Flowering Plants, and read the following Letter from Mr. Borrer to Mr. Forster, offering it for the Society's acceptance: viz.—

“ My dear Sir,

“ Will you trouble yourself to offer for me to the acceptance of the Linnean Society, as a contribution to their Herbarium, a collection, arranged in part only, of foreign flowering plants?

“ It contains European plants from Mertens, Woods, Hooker, &c., some of Drummond's American ones, nearly all of Gardner's, so far as they are as yet distributed, except the Cyperaceæ and the Grasses, and some North American from Hooker; several of the *Unio Itineraria* collections, from Arabia, Abyssinia, Algiers, Caucasus, Norway, the Pyrenees, &c.; Lippold's Madeira plants; a few from Australia, and home-dried garden specimens. From the *Unio* collections and from Lippold's the plants of the first five Linnean classes have been taken out.

“ Yours faithfully,

(Signed) “ W. BORRER.”

“ Henfield, Dec. 10, 1841.”

It was ordered that the special Thanks of the Society be presented to Mr. Borrer, for this important addition to the Society's Herbarium.

April 5. The Secretary announced that the Society had received, in pursuance of the bequest of the late Professor Don, his Herbarium and Collection of Woods and Fruits, with the exception of such as relate to *Materia Medica*.

April 19. The Secretary announced that the Treasurer had received from the Executors of the late Archibald Menzies, Esq., F.L.S., £90, being the amount of a legacy of £100, bequeathed by him to the Linnean Society, after deducting £10 for Legacy Duty.

May 24. In accordance with a Resolution of Council of the 26th ult., the Secretary read the following Statement, viz.

" LINNEAN SOCIETY,
April 26, 1842.

" The Council having had under their serious consideration the financial affairs of the Society, submit the following Statement to the Fellows at large.

" The cost of the Collections and Library of Linnæus, together with those of the first President, Sir James Edward Smith, purchased of the Executors of the latter in 1828, amounted to £3000. Of this sum about £1500 were then raised by subscription; and to meet the remainder a debt on bonds was incurred, which now amounts to £1300, paying interest at 5 per cent.

" In consequence partly of this amount of interest, and partly of a diminution in the Annual Receipts, there has been accumulated within the last few years a further debt of about £500.

" By recent arrangements a saving of some amount has been made in the Expenditure; but the Council are convinced that no further material reduction can be made without greatly impairing the efficiency of the Society, and they desire to avoid, as far as possible, the necessity of calling upon the Fellows to agree to a small charge being placed upon the Society's Publications; that appearing to be the most obvious means of supplying the deficiency in the Annual Receipts.

" With this view they propose a General Subscription, which, they trust, may reach such an amount as to meet the present liabilities, and to relieve the funds of the Society from the burthen of debt and interest. They therefore earnestly recommend the Subscription to the Members of the Society."

The following is a List of the Subscriptions received:—

	£	s.		£	s.
The Lord Bishop of Norwich, PRES.	50	0	Henry Beaufoy, Esq.	5	5
His Grace the Duke of Somerset ..	26	5	Thomas Bell, Esq.	21	0
His Grace the Duke of Northumber-			John J. Bennett, Esq., SECRETARY..	21	0
land	50	0	Rev. Miles Joseph Berkeley	5	0
The Right Hon. Earl Brownlow ..	20	0	John Blackwall, Esq.	10	0
William Anderson, Esq.	10	0	Francis Boott, Esq., M.D.	10	0
William Atkinson, Esq.	2	2	William Borrer, Esq.	21	0
Robert John Ashton, Esq.	5	0	William Borrer, Jun., Esq.	5	5
Charles Cardale Babington, Esq. ..	5	0	William Bridgman, Esq.	5	5
Rev. John Barlow	5	0	Lieut.-Gen. Sir T.M. Brisbane, K.C.B.	5	0

	£	s.		£	s.
Wm. Arnold Bromfield, Esq., M.D.	5	5	Rev. William Kirby	5	5
Henry Alexander Brown, Esq.	5	0	John Leonard Knapp, Esq.	5	0
Robert Brown, Esq., V.P.	21	0	Henry Lee, Esq., M.D.	2	2
Harford James J. Brydges, Esq.	5	0	William Horton Lloyd, Esq.	50	0
Walter Buchanan, Esq.	5	5	Sir John William Lubbock, Bart.	5	5
William John Burchell, Esq., LL.D.	5	0	Duncan M'Arthur, Esq., M.D.	1	1
Jonathan Couch, Esq.	1	0	Mr. James Main	1	1
Hugh Cuming, Esq.	5	0	Thomas White Mann, Esq.	4	4
Rev. William Cuthbert, D.D.	5	0	Gideon Mantell, Esq., LL.D.	5	0
James Charles Dale, Esq.	5	0	John Martin, Esq.	1	1
Charles Daubeny, Esq., M.D.	5	0	John Miers, Esq.	5	5
David Elisha Davy, Esq.	5	0	Ditto, Second Subscription	5	5
Lewis Weston Dillwyn, Esq.	10	0	Joshua Milne, Esq.	50	0
John Shute Duncan, Esq., D.C.L.	5	0	George Moore, Esq.	5	0
M. Pakenham Edgeworth, Esq.	5	0	R. I. Murchison, Esq.	10	0
Alexander Erskine, Esq.	10	10	Rev. Thomas Newton	5	0
Mr. James Forbes	1	1	William Ogilby, Esq.	5	0
Edward Forster, Esq., TREAS. & V.P.	21	0	Mr. William Pamplin	1	1
Edward Forster, Jun., Esq.	5	5	John Parkinson, Esq.	5	5
Thomas Forster, Esq., M.D.	5	5	Frederick J. Parry, Esq.	5	0
George Townshend Fox, Esq.	5	5	Algernon Peckover, Esq.	5	5
John Guillemard, Esq.	5	0	Louis Hayes Petit, Esq.	10	10
Rev. John Hailstone	5	0	William Pilkington, Esq.	10	0
John Alexander Hankey, Esq.	26	5	John Reeves, Esq.	5	0
Rev. Henry Hasted	3	3	Edward Rudge, Esq.	5	0
Ditto, Second Subscription	3	3	William Wilson Saunders, Esq.	5	5
Charles Hatchett, Esq.	5	0	Daniel Sharpe, Esq.	5	5
Rev. Henry Hawkes	5	5	Richard Horsman Solly, Esq.	21	0
Mr. Joseph Henderson	1	0	Sir George Thomas Staunton, Bart.	10	0
John Hogg, Esq.	3	3	Charles Stokes, Esq.	10	0
Sir William Jackson Hooker, V.P.	21	0	Richard Taylor, Esq.	21	0
Rev. Frederick William Hope	21	0	Rev. George Thackeray, D.D.	5	5
Thomas Charles Hope, Esq., M.D.	5	0	James Thomson, Esq.	5	5
Thomas Horsfield, Esq., M.D., V.P.	8	8	Nathaniel Bagshaw Ward, Esq.	10	0
James Charles Hurst, Esq.	2	2	John Obadiah Westwood, Esq.	7	7
Mr. Abel Ingpen	1	1	Alfred White, Esq.	10	0
Frederick H. Janson, Esq.	5	5	John Windsor, Esq.	3	3
Joseph Janson, Esq.	50	0	James Edward Winterbottom, Esq.	10	0
Capt. Theobald Jones, R.N., M.P.	5	0	Joseph Woods, Esq.	21	0
Benjamin Kennedy, Esq.	2	0	William Yarrell, Esq.	26	5
John Kidd, Esq.	5	0			
Mr. Richard Kippist	5	5			
			Total	£994	3

Nov. 1. A Letter from James Ebenezer Bicheno, Esq., F.L.S., addressed to the Secretary, was read as follows :—

“Athenæum, Oct. 31, 1842.

“My dear Sir,

“I am desirous of leaving behind me a small token of remembrance to the Linnean Society, among whom I have found, and I believe retained, many friends.

“I wish it had been something better than a Portrait of myself; but if they will do me the honour to accept of it, there are some perhaps who will occasionally call to mind the many pleasant, and to me profitable, hours we have spent together.

“I am, my dear Sir,

“Most faithfully and sincerely yours,

(Signed) “J. E. BICHENO.”

“John J. Bennett, Esq.,
Secretary of the Linnean Society.”

It was ordered that the special Thanks of the Society be returned to Mr. Bicheno for his very acceptable present.

1843.

Nov. 7. A Portrait of Sir William Jackson Hooker, V.P.L.S., painted by Signor Gambardella, was presented by the undermentioned Fellows :—

The Bishop of Norwich, *President*.
Robert Brown, Esq., *Vice-President*.
Edward Forster, Esq., *Vice-President*.
J. J. Bennett, Esq., *Secretary*.
Richard Taylor, Esq., *Under-Secretary*.
Thomas Bell, Esq.
Rev. M. J. Berkeley.
William Borrer, Esq.
William Borrer, Jun., Esq.
Francis Boott, Esq., M.D.
The Earl of Derby.
L. W. Dillwyn, Esq.
Sir Isaac L. Goldsmid, Bart.

Joseph Janson, Esq.
W. H. Lloyd, Esq.
George Loddiges, Esq.
Charles Lyell, Esq.
Joshua Milne, Esq.
Joseph Neeld, Esq.
J. W. Russell, Esq.
T. B. Salter, Esq., M.D.
Sir George Staunton, Bart.
Charles Stokes, Esq.
H. F. Talbot, Esq.
Dawson Turner, Esq.

A series of Cabinets for containing the Plants of Mr. Winch's Herbarium, and a large Cabinet for the reception of the Society's Col-

lection of Fruits, were presented by Joseph Janson, Esq., F.L.S.; and the special Thanks of the Society were directed to be given to Mr. Janson for his valuable present.

1844.

June 4. Read "An Attempt to arrange the *Carices* of Middle Europe," by Joseph Woods, Esq., F.L.S. &c.

In this paper Mr. Woods passes in review the principal characters by means of which the species of *Carices* may be arranged into groups, and adopts with some modifications the system of Koch. His arrangement is as follows:—

A. Spicâ unicâ simplici.

1. Diœcæ; stigmatibus 2.

1. *C. dioica*; 2. *C. Davalliana*.

2. Monœcæ; stigmatibus 2.

3. *C. pulicaris*; 4. *C. decipiens*; 5. *C. capitata*; 6. *C. Suteri*, which may belong to the following division, as the number of stigmas is not indicated.

3. Monœcæ; stigmatibus 3.

7. *C. microglochis*; 8. *C. pauciflora*; 9. *C. Pyrenaica*; 10. *C. spicata*; 11. *C. rupestris*.

B. Spicis capitatis involucretis.

12. *C. cyperoides*; 13. *C. Baldensis*.

C. Spicis compositis.

1. Stigmatibus 3.

14. *C. curvula*.

2. Stigmatibus 2; floribus sterilibus in spicarum apice.

15. *C. fœtida*; 16. *C. stenophylla*; 17. *C. lobata*; 18. *C. incurva*; 19. *C. schœnoides*; 20. *C. divisa*; 21. *C. chordorhiza*; 22. *C. vulpina*; 23. *C. muricata*; 24. *C. divulsa*; 25. *C. teretiuscula*; 26. *C. paradoxa*; 27. *C. paniculata*.

3. Stigmatibus 2; spicis aliis fertilibus aliis sterilibus, v. floribus sterilibus in mediâ spicâ, v. floribus sterilibus in aliis spiculis basalibus in aliis apicalibus.

28. *C. ludibunda*; 29. *C. intermedia*; 30. *C. modesta*; 31. *C. arenaria*; 32. *C. repens*; 33. *C. microstyla*.

4. Stigmatibus 2; floribus sterilibus in spicarum basi.

34. *C. brizoides*; 35. *C. Schreberi*; 36. *C. Ligerica*, Gay; 37. *C. stellulata*; 38. *C. grypos*; 39. *C. ovalis*; 40. *C. axillaris*; 41. *C. Bœnninghausiana*;

42. *C. remota*; 43. *C. elongata*; 44. *C. lagopina*; 45. *C. heleonastes*;
46. *C. curta*; 47. *C. loliacea*.

D. Spicis distinctis, omnibus androgynis; floribus sterilibus in apice spicarum;
stigmatibus 3.

48. *C. Linkii*; 49. *C. Sarda*.

E. Spicis lateralibus ♀; terminali androgynâ, floribus sterilibus apicalibus; stig-
matibus (nisi in *C. bicolore*) 3; fructu inconspicue rostrato.

50. *C. bicolor*; 51. *C. atrata*; 52. *C. aterrima*; 53. *C. nigra*; 54. *C. Vahlîi*;
55. *C. Buxbaumii*.

F. Spicis distinctis; stigmatibus 2.

1. Fructûs rostro complanato marginato.

56. *C. mucronata*; 57. *C. microstachya*.

2. Fructûs rostro parvo teretiusculo plerumque membranaceo.

58. *C. Grahami*; 59. *C. saxatilis*; 60. *C. Goodenovii*; 61. *C. rigida*; 62.
C. cœspitosa; 63. *C. trinervis*; 64. *C. aquatilis*; 65. *C. acuta*; 66. *C.*
Maenchiana.

G. Spicâ masculâ unicâ, fœmineâ unicâ vel pluribus; stigmatibus 3.

1. Spicis plerisque vel omnibus in apice culmi approximatis subsessilibus; fruc-
tûs rostro haud complanato vel bifido.

67. *C. supina*; 68. *C. platystachya*; 69. *C. macrolepis*; 70. *C. gynobasis*; 71.
C. Grioletti; 72. *C. tomentosa*; 73. *C. præcox*; 74. *C. mollis*; 75. *C. re-*
flexa; 76. *C. umbrosa*; 77. *C. pilulifera*; 78. *C. montana*; 79. *C. erice-*
torum.

2. Spicis plerisque vel omnibus in apice culmi approximatis subcorymbosis, fœ-
mineis pedunculatis masculæ subæqualibus; fructu glabro, rostro parvo
membranaceo vel nullo.

80. *C. rariflora*; 81. *C. limosa*; 82. *C. irrigua*; 83. *C. pallescens*; 84. *C. ustu-*
lata; 85. *C. capillaris*; 86. *C. nitida*; 87. *C. alba*.

3. Characteres ut in G. 2; sed fructu pubescente.

88. *C. digitata*; 89. *C. ornithopoda*.

4. Spicis cylindricis densissimis corymbosis; fructûs rostro robusto profundè
bifido.

90. *C. pseudo-cyperus*.

5. Spicis in apice culmi racemosis, summâ sessili, reliquis exsertè pedunculatis;
fructûs rostro bidentato margine scabro.

91. *C. fuliginosa*; 92. *C. frigida*.

6. Spicis plerisque in apice culmi sessilibus, vel inclusè breviter pedunculatis; fructu nisi in margine glabro, rostro complanato bifido.
93. *C. extensa*; 94. *C. flava*; 95. *C. Mairii*; 96. *C. Æderi*.
7. Spicis racemosis per culmi longitudinem descendentibus, superioribus sessilibus vel breviter inclusè pedunculatis, inferioribus subexsertè pedunculatis; fructûs rostro complanato bidentato.
97. *C. Hostiana*; 98. *C. fulva*; 99. *C. Hornschuchiana*; 100. *C. binervis*; 101. *C. levigata*; 102. *C. distans*; 103. *C. punctata*; 104. *C. Michelii*; 105. *C. brevicollis*; 106. *C. depauperata*; 107. *C. sylvatica*; 108. *C. tenuis*.
8. Characteres ut in G. 7; sed fructûs rostro incerto.
109. *C. ferruginea*; 110. *C. geniculata*; 111. *C. brevifolia*; 112. *C. spadicea*; 113. *C. sempervirens*; 114. *C. firma*; 115. *C. refracta*; 116. *C. fimbriata*.
9. Spicis racemosis; fructu pubescente.
117. *C. clandestina*.
10. Spicis laxè racemosis; fructûs rostro teretiusculo brevi, vel membranaceo v. nullo.
118. *C. panicea*; 119. *C. vaginata*; 120. *C. pilosa*; 121. *C. strigosa*.
11. Spicis longis densis pendulis.
122. *C. pendula*; 123. *C. microcarpa*.

H. Spicis masculis pluribus; stigmatibus 3.

1. Fructu vix rostrato, aliquando supernè scabro sed haud undique pubescente.
124. *C. glauca*; 125. *C. claviformis*; 126. *C. Genuensis*; 127. *C. lasiochlæna*; 128. *C. lanceolata*; 129. *C. acuminata*; 130. *C. longiaristata*; 131. *C. hispida*.
2. Fructu pilosissimo; rostro bifido.
132. *C. filiformis*; 133. *C. evoluta*; 134. *C. hirta*.
3. Fructu haud piloso; rostro bifido.
135. *C. secalina*; 136. *C. hordeiformis*; 137. *C. vesicaria*; 138. *C. ampullacea*; 139. *C. riparia*; 140. *C. Soleirolii*; 141. *C. nutans*; 142. *C. paludosa*.

On many of these species, and on other named species which Mr. Woods regards merely as varieties of one or other of the foregoing, the paper contains critical observations. Of the following species the descriptions are not sufficiently complete to allow of the author

placing them: *C. alopecurus*, Lap.; *C. juncoides*, Presl; *C. costata*, Presl; *C. furcata*, Lap.; *C. manostachys*, Spr.; *C. fusca*, All.; *C. nesliaca*, Suter; *C. Bastardiana*, DeC.; and *C. badia*, Pers.

Dec. 17. Read "Additional Remarks on *Spongilla fluviatilis*," by John Hogg, Esq., M.A., F.R.S., F.L.S., F.C.P.S. &c. &c.

In this paper Mr. Hogg commences by claiming a priority to M. Laurent in discovering the locomotive germ-like bodies of *Spongilla*, in ascertaining that they are a second sort of reproductive bodies of that substance, and in comparing them with the spontaneously moving sporules of *Ectosperma clavata* of Unger. In proof of this priority he refers to his memoir, published in 1840, in the third part of the eighteenth volume of the Society's Transactions, in the first portion of which, read before the Society on the 18th of December 1838, those bodies are described as having been observed by him in August 1838, are proved by direct experiment to be capable of reproducing the *Spongilla*, and are compared with the locomotive sporules of *Ectosperma*. An abstract of this portion of Mr. Hogg's memoir appeared in the 'Proceedings' of the Society at the beginning of 1839, and was reprinted in the number of the 'Annals of Natural History' for March 1839. Of these several publications Mr. Hogg states that no notice is taken by M. Laurent in his recent work entitled 'Recherches sur l'Hydre et l'Éponge d'Eau douce,' Paris 1844, in which the discovery of the locomotive germs of the freshwater sponge is apparently claimed by the author as his own.

Mr. Hogg then proceeds to remark on the discrepancies of authors with regard to the existence of cilia on these bodies, and on the sporules of the *Ectosperma*. He accounts for his having overlooked them in the *Spongilla*, on the supposition that the germs which he observed under a very high power of the compound microscope had reached the period when, as M. Laurent states, "ils perdent leurs cils pour toujours," and notices that it appears, from M. Thuret's recent observations, that the same circumstance occurs in the sporules

of the *Ectosperma*. This resorption or disappearance of the cilia after a certain period will readily account for the denial of their existence by practised microscopical observers.

The existence of cilia subservient to locomotion is far from determining, in Mr. Hogg's opinion, the question of the animal nature of the bodies to which they belong, although the zoocarpical theory, which he regards as most improbable, appears to be still gaining ground. He thinks the motive power of the cilia of the sporules of *Spongilla* and the *Algæ*, as also of the Sea-Sponges, to be dependent on some peculiar organization not connected (as in the locomotive gemmules of a zoophyte) with any muscular apparatus; unless indeed, as he has before suggested, mere endosmosis and exosmosis should be found sufficient to produce it.

Mr. Hogg refers to the very great similarity between the locomotive sporules of *Ectosperma* as figured by M. Thuret, of *Spongilla* as given by M. Laurent, and of *Spongia* as represented by Dr. Grant. The granular epispore to which the cilia are attached, described and figured by M. Thuret as investing the sporule of *Ectosperma*, is perceptible in M. Laurent's figure of that of *Spongilla*, and plainly seen in Dr. Grant's of *Spongia*; and it evidently differs from the covering (*epigemmule*) of the locomotive gemmule of a zoophyte. No mention is made by M. Laurent of the papillæ discovered by Mr. Hogg, with a magnifying power of above 400, on the external covering of the locomotive sporules of *Spongilla*, and described by him at p. 378 of the previous volume; but Mr. Hogg believes that if the sporule figured by M. Laurent (at pl. 1. fig. G. 1 a.) had been more highly magnified, the exceedingly minute granulations just visible near the extreme edge of that figure would have proved to be these granular papillæ. He also adverts to the argument derived by M. Laurent in favour of the animal nature of *Spongilla*, from its scissiparous reproduction, and compares this process with the observations of M. Thuret on the scissiparous division of *Ectosperma*, with the view of showing that there is a more perfect analogy with the latter, and consequently with *Algæ*, than with *Hydra* and other *Polypes*.

For these and other reasons which are detailed in his paper, Mr. Hogg still believes both the *River* and *Sea-Sponges* to be vegetable productions, and maintains that "until they shall be discovered to possess a stomach or a gastric sac, no zoologist can possibly consider them to belong to the Animal Kingdom."

1845.

March 18. A Letter was read from Alfred White, Esq., F.L.S., addressed to the Secretary, accompanying the presentation of a Microscope to the Society, as follows:—

" 15 Cloudesley Square,
18th March, 1845.

" My dear Sir,

" It is with much pleasure I forward to you the accompanying Microscope for presentation to the Linnean Society, in the name of the following Fellows, who desire that it may be used at any time for the illustration of Papers read before the Society, and left for the use of the Members at other times under such regulations as the Council may consider sufficient to protect it from injury.

" I remain, dear Sir,

" Yours very truly,

(Signed)

" ALFRED WHITE."

Edward Forster, Esq., *Vice-President*.
J. J. Bennett, Esq., *Secretary*.
Thomas Bell, Esq.
F. Boott, Esq., M.D.
Edward Doubleday, Esq.
J. A. Hankey, Esq.
J. D. Hooker, Esq., M.D.
Joseph Janson, Esq.
F. H. Janson, Esq.
T. C. Janson, Esq.
W. H. Lloyd, Esq.

Joshua Milne, Esq.
F. G. P. Neison, Esq.
Daniel Sharpe, Esq.
R. H. Solly, Esq.
W. H. Solly, Esq.
Edward Solly, Esq.
N. B. Ward, Esq.
Alfred White, Esq.
J. E. Winterbottom, Esq.
William Yarrell, Esq.

It was ordered that the Thanks of the Society be given to the Fellows named in the Letter for their valuable present.